
EDITORIAL

This journal began with the e-Signature Law Journal (2004-2005), before being re-named the Digital Evidence Journal (2006-2007), until the present title was decided upon in 2008 to reflect the full range of legal and technical issues associated with electronic signatures and electronic evidence. Well-established journals have begun to publish articles on these topics, but as the two articles published in this issue by Denise H. Wong and Deveral Capps on legal education demonstrate, there is still a long way to go before the legal profession grasp that it needs to educate itself in such important matters. Until such time, those exposed to prosecution, or litigation in civil proceedings, will continue to be fortunate if they find a lawyer that is familiar with the issues surrounding electronic evidence. This is because the preponderant attitude appears to be one of relaxed insouciance. Electronic signatures and electronic evidence are considered as ‘niche’ areas of law – as if having a bank account, credit cards, debit cards, using a computer, the internet, e-mail, a mobile telephone, driving a motor car, flying in an aircraft or travelling on a railway train, the underground or metro (the list goes on and on and on) is nothing any lawyer actually indulges in: nor, for that matter, do their clients.

These comments do not apply to any of the past and current members of the editorial board, the correspondents from previous years or the contributors that have helped to make this journal a critical success. I thank everyone who has had the kindness to be involved in this enterprise.

It is time that those responsible for educating lawyers – universities and the legal profession – consider taking the subject seriously. For this purpose, a proposed framework for a syllabus on electronic evidence, in the first instance covering 4.5 hours, is set out below. Also included are a number of materials that the educator might find to be helpful. The case of Julie Amero has proved to be an excellent method of educating lawyers and judges cross the world since 2008, although no doubt other more up-to-date exercises will be developed over time.